

Reply to Notice of Allowance Dated 3/10/2006
Amendment Dated: April 17, 2006

Appl. No.: 09/910,937
Attorney Docket No.: CSCO-005/2899

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-20, 22-32, and 34-40 were allowed in the Notice of Allowance dated 3/10/2006. Applicants note with appreciation that all claims were indicated to be allowable. By virtue of this response, claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 29, 32, 36, 37 and 41 are sought to be amended. The amendments are believed not to introduce new matter and their entry is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-20, 22-32, and 34-40 are thus presented for consideration further in view of the below remarks.

Email Communications with the Examiner

The claims were allowed pursuant to an Examiner's Amendment mailed along with the Notice of Allowance. The undersigned representative had authorized the amendments in a telephone conversation. Subsequent to the telephone conversation, but prior to the mail date of the Notice of Allowance, the undersigned representative had requested the Examiner by email to mail a formal office action, noting that this will provide a chance to correct errors in claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In an email dated March 07 2006, Examiner Chan indicated that the allowance had already been submitted and suggested that the errors in claims be submitted in an amendment under 37 CFR § 1.132. The notice of allowance was then mailed on March 10 2006.

The applicant is believed to have met the burden of making of record the Substance of the communications with the Examiner. See MPEP 713.04 for further clarification.

Amendments

In this response, the claims are amended to fix various informalities. In particular, it is noted that the amendments to the independent claims is consistent with the various


Reply to Notice of Allowance Dated 3/10/2006
Amendment Dated: April 17, 2006

Appl. No.: 09/910,937
Attorney Docket No.: CSCO-005/2899

dependent claims. For example, claims 5-9 relate to transmission of packets in the direction of the remote systems to the service domains, and claims 10-11 relate to transmission of packets in the reverse direction. The amendments to the base claim 1 cover transmission expressly in either direction.

- 5 The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if a telephone interview will be useful for whatever reason.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: April 17, 2006

Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416